



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Takashi Ueda

Application No.: 09/802,987

Filing Date: March 12, 2001

Title: RINTING APPARATUS, METHOD AND PROGRAM PRODUCT

Group Art Unit: 2626

Examiner: Satwant K. Singh

Confirmation No.: 6966

AMENDMENT/REPLY TRANSMITTAL LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Enclosed is a reply for the above-identified patent application.

☐ A Petition for Extension of Time is also enclosed.

☐ Terminal Disclaimer(s) and the ☐ \$65.00 (2814) ☐ \$130.00 (1814) fee per Disclaimer due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.

☐ Also enclosed is/are _____

☐ Small entity status is hereby claimed.

☐ Applicant(s) requests continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and enclose the ☐ \$395.00 (2801) ☐ \$790.00 (1801) fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(e).

☐ Applicant(s) requests that any previously unentered after final amendments not be entered. Continued examination is requested based on the enclosed documents identified above.

☐ Applicant(s) previously submitted _____

_____ on _____,
for which continued examination is requested.

☐ Applicant(s) requests suspension of action by the Office until at least _____, which does not exceed three months from the filing of this RCE, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.103(c). The required fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.

☐ A Request for Entry and Consideration of Submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) (1809/2809) is also enclosed.

- ☒ No additional claim fee is required.
- ☐ An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below.

AMENDED CLAIMS					
	No. of Claims	Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For	Extra Claims	Rate	Additional Fee
Total Claims	16	MINUS 20 =	0	x \$50.00 (1202) =	\$ 0.00
Independent Claims	6	MINUS 6 =	0	x \$200.00 (1201) =	\$ 0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$360.00 (1203)					
Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0.00
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$ 0.00

- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed for the fee due.
- ☐ Charge _____ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800.
- ☐ Charge _____ to credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.


The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: January 21, 2005

By 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP AMENDMENT
Takashi Ueda)	
Application No.: 09/802,987)	Group Art Unit: 2626
Filed: March 12, 2001)	Examiner: Satwant K. Singh
For: PRINTING APPARATUS, METHOD)	Confirmation No.: 6966
AND PROGRAM PRODUCT)	
)	
)	
)	

AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated October 21, 2004 the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,351,317, hereinafter *Sasaki*.

Claim 1 of the present application defines a printing apparatus which creates print data from received job data in accordance with an indication of a command associated with a job data and executes printing. The printing apparatus includes, among other elements, a determination section for determining one or more commands to be subjected to replacement processing on the basis of the execution time and execution number of times of each command acquired by said execution time measuring section and said execution number counting section. The apparatus also includes a replacement section for executing replacement processing for replacing the commands determined by the determination section with other commands which can be executed in shorter time.

As an exemplary example, to which the present invention is not limited, the Examiner's attention is directed to Figures 7A and 7B, wherein a replacement command is illustrated. Specifically, Figure 7A illustrates one possible series of commands which includes four steps of adding four lines which form a square. The replacement steps are illustrated in Figure 7B, wherein the first step includes the placement of a black square, and a second step includes the placement of a white square within the black square, the result being four lines similar to those illustrated in Figure 7A, but requiring two, instead of four steps. See pages 19 and 20 of the present application.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner alleges that *Sasaki* discloses the elements of claim 1. However, *Sasaki* discloses a printing system using a communication network that includes monitoring the speed at which data is input to a printer controller from a local network. The printer controller measures the rate at which data is input to the printer controller and based on this rate determines whether or not the image data is being transmitted at an acceptable rate. If it is not being transmitted at an acceptable rate, and if other conditions, such as resolution, are acceptable, the printer controller stops the reception of the image data in the high resolution, and then changes the resolution of the image data from the high resolution to the low resolution, and then receives the image data in low resolution. See column 16, lines 49-59. Alternatively, the printer controller can move the print job down the order of print jobs and finish the print job at a later time. See column 17, lines 38-47. However, *Sasaki* does not teach or suggest the combination of claim 1 that includes, among other elements, a replacement section for executing replacement processing for replacing the command determined by the determination

section with another command which can be executed in a shorter time. Specifically, in *Sasaki*, the printer controller either receives the image data at a lower resolution (a higher speed) or moves the print job to a later time in the print job list. At no point does *Sasaki* teach or suggest replacing one execution command with another execution command that may be executed in a shorter time. Accordingly, *Sasaki* does not teach or suggest important elements of claim 1.

Claim 4 defines a printing apparatus which creates print data from received job data in accordance with an indication of a command associated with a job data and executes printing. The printing apparatus of claim 4 includes, among other elements, a determination section for determining one or more commands to be subjected to parallel processing on the basis of the execution time and execution number of times of each command acquired by said execution time measuring section and the execution number and counting section. It also includes a controlling section for controlling the first and second processing sections to execute parallel processing of the job data with which the command determined by the determination section is associated. *Sasaki* does not teach or suggest the features of claim 4, which include, among other elements, the processing sections that execute parallel processing. The sections in *Sasaki* identified by the Examiner merely reduce the resolution of image data or replace image data by blank spaces. There is no teaching or suggestion of parallel processing.

Claim 7 defines a printing method which includes determining one or more commands to be subjected to replacement processing and executing replacement processing for replacing the determined commands. Accordingly, claim 7 is also

patentable over *Sasaki* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim

1.

Claim 9 defines a printing method which includes, among other elements, determining one or more commands to be subjected to parallel processing and controlling processing sections to execute parallel processing of the job data. Accordingly, claim 9 is patentable over *Sasaki* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Claim 12 defines a program product which corresponds to the method of claim 7. And, claim 14 defines a program product that corresponds to claim 9. Accordingly, claims 12 and 14 are also patentable over *Sasaki* at least for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 7 and 9.

The remaining claims are dependent claims which depend either directly or indirectly from the above-identified independent claims.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: January 21, 2005

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620